DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 759 IR 052 479

AUTHOR Turock, Betty J.
TITLE Public Library Service for Older Adults: Update 1986. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Rutgers, The State Univ., New Brunswick, NJ. School of Communication, Information, and Library Studies.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 15 Jul 87
CONTRACT 300-86-0043
NOTE 100p.; For reports on the 1971 study, see ED 067 521 and ED 072 835.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Coordination; *Library Expenditures; *Library Extension; *Library Services; Library Surveys; *Older Adults; *Outreach Programs; Public Libraries

ABSTRACT

This study, which updates the 1971 "National Survey of Library Services to the Aging," was undertaken in 1986 to identify, describe, and compare the extent and variety of current services with those in 1971; measure variables in organizational support and suggest how they might influence service; and make recommendations for future development. This survey found that: (1) there had been limited progress over the past decade and little evidence that public library services for older adults had kept pace with the increase in the number of persons aged 65 and older in the nation; (2) about two-thirds of the public libraries gave low priority to program development for older adults when compared to other age groups; (3) funds for these services made up no more than 2% of the budgets of these public libraries; (4) staffing constituted less than 3% of the available workforce; (5) on average, less than 7% of the nation's elders were reached by public library service as defined by this survey; (6) the majority of public libraries had older adult volunteers and employees, although the proportion of the latter was decreasing; (7) the majority of the libraries worked with other community agencies in the aging network; and (8) services for older adults were not generally considered distinct program entities and there was no administrative structure for their overall coordination. Study data are displayed in 18 tables. (31 bibliographic notes/references) (Author/EW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297759

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE FOR OLDER ADULTS: UPDATE 1986

FINAL REPORT

Contract 300-86-0043

July 15, 1987

Dr. Betty J. Turock

Principal Investigator

Rutgers University

School of Communication, Information and Library Studies

IR052479

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

An update of the National Survey of Library Services to the Aging was undertaken to: 1) identify, describe, and compare the extent and variety of current services with those in 1971; 2) measure variables in organizational support and suggest how they might influence service; and 3) make recommendations for future development.

There was limited progress over the past decade and little evidence that public library services for older adults had kept pace with the increase in the number of 65+ persons in the nation.

About two-thirds of the public libraries gave a low priority to program development for older adults, when compared to other age groups.

Funds for services comprised no more than two percent of the budgets of these public libraries.

Staffing constituted less than three percent of the available workforce.

On the average, less than seven percent of the nation's elders were reached by public library service, as defined by this study.

The majority of public libraries had older adult volunteers and employees, although the proportion of the latter was decreasing.

The majority worked with other community agencies in the aging network.

Services for older adults were not generally considered distinct program entities and there was no administrative structure for their overall coordination.

CONTENTS

Introduction..... 1

Prior Research..... 2

Methodology..... 3

- Data Collection
- Data Analysis

Findings: Service Provision..... 8

- Demographic Distribution
- Extent of Service
  - Services Offered
  - Services Initiated and Terminated
  - Older Adults Served
  - Service Promotion

Findings: Organizational Support..... 17

- Priority for Service
- Financial Support
- Administrative Patterns
  - Staffing
  - Organizational Structure
- Cooperation with Community Agencies
- Perceived Barriers to Service
- Older Adults as Library Resources

Discussion..... 30

- Service Provision
- Organizational Support
- The Future
- Dissemination

References..... 39

Appendix..... 42

INTRODUCTION

One of the most significant demographic facts affecting American society is the aging of its population. One in nine citizens has reached the age of 65 [1]. Whereas, in 1900 people 65 and over accounted for 4.1 percent of the total U.S. inhabitants, now they comprise 11.4 percent. Forecasts show that the 26.5 million elders counted in 1981 will grow in number to 56 million by 2030, when they will represent between 14 and 22 percent of the national population [2]. Each day 5,000 persons become 65 and 3,400 persons aged 65-plus die, for a net addition of about 1,600--almost 600,000 per year [3]. In the last decade alone the number of older adults in our country has increased by approximately 30 percent [4].

Library literature contends that although public libraries have developed services for elders over a 40 year period, it is within the last decade that those services have been propelled to a place where they are receiving the attention they deserve [5,6,7]. At the close of the first White House Conference on Library and Information Services (WHCLIS) in 1979, programs for older adults were named a priority [8]. Conferees from all over the country brought resolutions calling upon libraries to target new services addressing older people's concerns. The 1981 White House Conference on Aging (WHCOA) concluded with recommendations that supported specific funding for library services for older adults [9]. More recently Public Law 98-480, encouraging each state to provide access to library programs for elders, demonstrates the increasing interest of the U.S. Congress in service to this target population. Since the political activity of older adults is second only to that of adults aged 34 to 55, response to their needs is not solely an altruistic course of action. Future fiscal implications hang heavy in the air for the public library as well.

While we know that new programs have developed at specific locations for older adults and the professionals who serve them through a network of social service agencies and organizations, to date there is no evidence to support or deny whether advances have been made in the range, volume, and sophistication of public library services. We only speculate that the majority of public libraries have shared in the heightened emphasis on aging that permeates the society at large.

PRIOR RESEARCH

In preparation for the 1971 White House Conference on Aging an extensive investigation--supported by the Higher Education Act, Title III--was conducted by Booz, Allen & Hamilton, under the joint auspices of the U.S. Office of Education and the Cleveland Public Library. The purpose of the National Survey of Library Services to the Aging was "to determine the scope and extent of programs rendered to persons over 65 by public libraries" [10, p. 2]. The period selected for study was the decade from 1961-1971. Although data were gathered on library education for service to the aging and on services emanating from state libraries and state institutions, the emphasis was on the public library.

For the research, public libraries in the 50 states offering elder services were identified by state libraries, regional Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) Program Officers, public library leaders in older adult service, and a review of the literature. Questionnaires were sent to the 390 organizations nominated. From the 244 responses received, the Study documented that:

1) Library services to the aging had not developed at a pace consistent with the increase in the number of 65+ persons in the nation

and commensurate with the increase in national interest in the needs and problems of the aging.

2) About 2/3 of the public libraries gave the aging a low priority for program development, compared to other groups in the population.

3) Funds for services to the aging constituted less than one percent of the budgets of public libraries.

4) Staffing of services for the aging was minimal.

5) Lack of recognition of services to the aging in local public library plans, programs and organizational structures inhibited the development of adequate services. [10, p. 36]

But that research was completed over a decade ago; later investigations have confined their study to one state or region [5,11]. Since the National Survey provided a blueprint for the development of services for over a decade, an update is repeatedly called for by experts in the field [5,6,7]. A summary of current practices compared to earlier benchmark data can provide a useful context for: Determining the extent of progress made, identifying strengths and weaknesses in the present range of services, and suggesting action for the future.

METHODOLOGY

One of the major assumptions of the National Survey was that the public libraries identified accounted for all of the services for older adults offered in 1971. Several regional investigations since then have cast doubt on that assumption, however, most notably one completed in Illinois in 1981 [11]. While the preponderance of the respondents in the National Survey could report some services to older adults, only 37 percent of those in Illinois, where all public libraries were surveyed, could do so, despite the fact that Illinois

is one of the few states that has emphasized services for elders. Another plausible assumption is that rather than representing the entire universe, the public libraries nominated in 1971 attracted attention because they offered exemplary service.

For the purpose of this study the major definitions by which data were collected for the National Survey were retained. Older adults were described chronologically as those 65 years of age and over (65+). As in its predecessor, this investigation denoted service for older adults as any library offering: (1) which was developed specifically for the aging, or (2) in which 50 percent of the participants were 65+. This eliminated services provided routinely to clientele, such as general circulation and reference. The period of study for the Update was 1972-1986, a time span four years longer than the earlier effort.

The major purpose for conducting the current research was to initiate revitalized discussion, debate and action concerning public library services for the nation's elders.

The specific objectives for which funding was sought from the U.S. Department of Education were:

1. To update and amplify the National Survey by identifying and describing current library services and comparing their extent and variety with services in 1971.

2. To measure variables in organizational support and suggest how they might be influencing service provision.

3. To make recommendations for future development.

4. To sponsor a Symposium where the research results would be described and presentations would be made by experts from both the aging network and from library practice as a preliminary to the formulation of a plan of action for the next decade.

5. To disseminate widely among librarians, library educators, older adults and their service providers information about the Update.

Data Collection

The Update was conducted in two phases. In Phase I the 390 libraries in the 1971 study population were surveyed once again. State libraries received lists of the local agencies within their jurisdictions that were solicited in 1971 with a request to broaden the sample to include libraries currently offering elder services that were not nominated in 1971. Administrative Librarians in the U.S. Department of Education's Division of Library Programs, who now perform the duties of LSCA Officers, identified programs throughout the United States; LSCA records were examined to assist in the task. Once again these efforts were supplemented by input from leaders in services for the aging across the United States and a review of the literature [4-7,11-27].

In Phase II a random sample of public libraries was drawn from communities with populations of 25,000 or more. Although the 1971 survey had called for such a follow-up to determine whether the status of services for older adults as depicted from study results on the nominated libraries were representative of public libraries in general, no such follow-up had been conducted. The American Library Directory was the source from which 540 public libraries were randomly chosen. In that process, nominated sites were eliminated from being selected a second time.

The instrument employed in the Update was a modified version of the National Survey. For the earlier research an open-ended questionnaire--frequently utilized in exploratory research--was formulated. In the current effort closed, structured alternatives less likely to suffer from subjective interpretation in data analysis were created from the 1971 results. In other

instances service options were added to reflect opportunities made explicit since 1971. The questionnaire was organized to gather information in four broad library sponsored service categories, the first three of which were part of the National Survey; the fourth was added in the Update. Those categories were:

1. **Extension Services.** Activities that increase access to materials for elders who cannot conveniently use library facilities because of impaired mobility and other barriers--in other words, delivery systems, such as books-by-mail, bookmobiles, personal home or bedside delivery, subbranches or deposit collections in service centers, nursing homes, and apartments for the aging.

2. **Special Resources.** Materials and adjunct equipment for those older adults who experience disabilities that interfere with the use of standard media, e.g., large print books, talking books, reading aids.

3. **Group Programs.** Activities held either within the library or in places where the aging congregate--nutrition sites, service centers, drop-in centers, and homes for the aging.

4. **Special Services.** Activities targeted for older adults that amplify traditional services, e.g., information and referral (I&R), oral history, and lifelong learning.

Other sections of the instrument were designed to gather information on organizational support for library services for older adults. A copy of the finalized questionnaire can be found in the Appendix. After a pretest and modifications, it was mailed to each of the public libraries identified. Six weeks later, a second letter, instrument, and mailing essentials were sent to those who had not responded.

In Phase I in addition to the 390 libraries surveyed in the earlier study, 128, an added 33 percent, were located. Replies were received from

331, or 64 percent of the total 518. Of these, 318, or 61 percent, contained usable data. In Phase II replies were received from 325, or 60 percent of the total 540. Of these 275, or 51 percent, contained usable data.

To determine whether a nonresponse bias was present, 20 percent of the libraries that did not return the questionnaire were called. In Phase I they were contacted in proportion to their number in the nonrespondent group, i.e., 33 from the original sample and 4 from those added in 1986. In Phase II, 38 were called. Information was sought about why the library had decided not to take part in the study and whether it offered services for older adults. Lack of time was the main reason for nonresponse with lack of interest a close second.

The libraries polled were asked selected questions from the survey instrument. Results were compared to those of the respondents. In both phases a t-test at the 95 percent confidence level was conducted; no significant difference between the two groups was discovered. Therefore, nonresponse was assumed not to have biased the findings.

Data Analysis

Using the SAS statistical package, data were analyzed in two major ways. First, comparisons were made between data from the 1971 National Survey and Phase I, nominated libraries in the Update 1986 to determine whether library services had changed at a pace consistent with the increase in older adults in the national population. Whenever possible analysis followed the 1971 methods. While the action plan for the study had proposed a series of comparisons between the National Survey and the Update based on inferential statistics, in most cases insufficient data were reported in the original effort to make that possible. As an alternative, where feasible, in Phase I

the Update sample was divided into two groups--those included in the 1971 study and those added in the current effort--and comparisons made between them on the assumption that the libraries with the longer commitment should have a more favorable inclination toward serving older adults.

Next, comparisons were made between data from Phase I and Phase II of the Update 1986 to determine whether the nominated sites had service patterns similar to those offered by the random sample. This would allow some judgment about the representativeness of the nominated libraries.

The fact that statistical records were not routinely maintained on elder services by many public libraries led to some calculations on an ad hoc basis in 1986, as it had in 1971. Where evidence of discrepancies or misinterpretation of questions was obvious, follow-up calls were made to reconcile the information supplied. Still some service estimates were not exact. Although from the 1971 report it was impossible to judge whether the variety and focus of programmatic content discovered in 1986 was or was not characteristic of earlier services, some general comparisons could be made. In addition, data were reviewed to determine whether recommendations for improving services for older adults, put forth by the 1971 research, had been implemented.

FINDINGS: SERVICE PROVISION

Survey respondents represented the District of Columbia and all 50 states--except for Alaska where 15,000 older adults account for 3.1 percent of the population, the lowest proportion in the country. Twelve states reported services in the Update that had not in the National Survey; they included Delaware, Hawaii, Iowa, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Demographic Distribution

Evidence was analyzed to draw some conclusions about changes in the distribution of both older adults in the population and library services for them. For this purpose data from the 1971 Study and Phase I of the Update were compared. First, to determine whether there was a relationship between the provision of exemplar service and the number of older adults in the population, data from the National Survey and the Update were aggregated within seven regions--New England, Middle Atlantic, Midwest, South, Southwest, Mountain, and West--and Pearson correlation coefficients, computed across regions, were calculated with the following results:

National Survey	Update, Phase I
(n = 244)	(n = 293)
r = .771, p .04	r = .778, p .03

The null hypothesis of no association was rejected at the .05 confidence level in both cases; there was a reasonably strong positive relationship between the two variables. In general, the more older adults in residence in the region, the more libraries present that provided them with services.

Next, regional change in the proportion of elders and libraries with services was tabulated. As Table I shows, the highest percentage of libraries reporting older adults service were nominated in the Midwest and South in both instances.

[INSERT TABLE I HERE]

The South experienced one of the top increases in the provision of service as well, paralleling, but not equally, the greatest growth in elder population found in any of the country's regions. However, while older adults were adding more than 25 percent to their number in New England, the Mountain states, and the West, there was no comcomitant expansion in first rate library

services. In fact, only the Southwest experienced a greater gain in service provision than in elders.

Finally, to supply information about changes in the percentage of older adults in the three major residential settings and the public libraries offering service in those environments, Phase I data were divided into intervals prescribed by the Library General Information Survey (LIBGIS); collapsed into rural, suburban, and urban categories; and compared with National Survey findings. Table II shows the results.

[INSERT TABLE II HERE]

In 1971, of the 190 respondents offering services that also provided information on population size, 57 percent were located in predominantly urban areas where according to the 1970 Census about 33 percent of the aging population lived; 26 percent in suburban environs with about 28 percent of the aging; and 17 percent in rural areas with about 39 percent of the aging. In 1986, service provision in the suburbs approximated the percent of elder residents, as indicated by the 1980 Census. However, the majority of libraries providing service were still found in the urban setting, even though these locales had experienced a three percent decline in the 65+ population. The least service was discovered once again in rural areas where the most older adults reside.

Extent of Service

Since the National Survey had defined the broad categories of library services traditionally associated with older adults, Phases I and II of the Update attempted to inventory the extent and variety of current services more precisely. Specific offerings were enumerated in the questionnaire under the categories Extension, Special Resources, Group Programs, and Special

Services. Respondents were asked to check those made available; provide their inclusive service dates; and if terminated, the reason for that action.

For the National Survey and the Update, respondents were also asked to supply the number of older adults regularly served by the four major categories, but the data were defined differently. In the earlier study the figures were tallied then divided by the total number of older adults living in the combined service areas to denote the market penetration, i.e., the percent of the potential older adult audience served by public libraries. There are at least two problems with such an approach. First, based on library service history, it is safe to assume that the same older adults used more than one service. Second, since regular use was not operationally defined, data were probably collected for different time periods. As a result, for the Update, regular use referred to the number served annually and the proportion of elders served was calculated for the major categories of service from which overall market penetration was estimated. No attempt was made to reflect on the total number of older adults reached by all services.

Services Offered. Data, collected on services, were analyzed for growth in number and in type. A gain of 65 nominated libraries reporting programs, or 29 percent, was found. In the National Survey 228 of the 244 libraries, or 93 percent, had indicated services in one or more of the categories outlined. In Phase I of the Update a similar proportion, but a higher volume, 293 of the 318 respondents, or 92 percent, declared elder services. In Phase II of the Update 240 of the 275 respondents, or 89 percent, reported offering older adult services.

The variety and frequency of the services is recorded for Phases I and II of the Update in Table III; no such data were available for 1971.

[INSERT TABLE III HERE]

For both the nominated libraries and the random sample, the provision of large print books topped the list, with 91 percent and 84 percent respectively indicating that these special materials were available for elder users. Delivery to institutions and the homebound, the provision of talking books and magnifying devices were also among the most highly cited in both cases. Films were the basis for most of the group programming both within and outside the library among nominated libraries, but in the random sample films received less attention. Oral history, an exercise leading to the integration of life experience, perceived by gerontologists as an important task of the later years, was available for elder participation in 16 percent of all Phase I libraries and close to the same amount at 14 percent in the Phase II libraries. Aging awareness and services for older adult service providers were at the lowest end of the scale. At the same time, most lifelong learning activities and information and referral were observed less than 10 percent of the time in both cases; only literacy programs came anywhere near 20 percent. When asked to add services not accounted for by the questionnaire, 75 libraries, or 24 percent of the Phase I respondents, supplied information, as did 10, or 4 percent, of the Phase II respondents. Except where enumerated in parentheses the services listed below were volunteered by only one site.

Extension

1) Radio Reading
2) Hospital Deposit Collections (5)
3) Newsletters for Homebound Elderly
4) Storytelling (3)

Special Resources

1) Closed Circuit Magnifying TV Monitors
2) Closed Captioned Films and Video Cassettes (4)
3) Multimedia, Multisensory Kits (6)
4) Books on Tape and Cassette (7)
5) Large Print Newspapers and Periodicals (10)
6) Braille Typewriters (3)
7) Braille Books (7)
8) Visual Tek Print Enlarger (8)
9) Telephone Amplifiers
10) Large Print Bibliograhpies
11) Large Print Bookmarks
12) Distribution of Aging Network Publications (5)
13) Hearing Loops
14) Foreign Language Materials

Group Programs

Within the Library

1) Library Tours (3)
2) Writers' Workshops
3) Arts and Crafts
4) Puppetry (2)

Outside the Library

1) Recreational Trips
2) Historic Walks
3) Information Booths at Senior Fairs, Exhibitions (4)
4) Library Service Talks

Special Services

1) Library Skills Classes
2) Waiver of Fines
3) Income Tax Assistance (8)
4) Day Care
5) Space for Community Programming

For comparative purposes, programs were aggregated by the major categories--Extension, Special Resources, Group Programs, and Special Services. Table IV illustrates the development since the National Survey.

[INSERT TABLE IV HERE]

All four of the categories measured in the National Survey showed increases in volume when compared to the Update Phase I. Group Programs held outside the library had the highest percent of growth, but Extension and Special Resources were still supplied by the highest proportion of libraries--the former by more than 80 percent and the latter by 92 percent. Special Services, recognized within the last decade as important to the developmental and informational needs of elders, although offered by the lowest proportion, were reported by the majority of libraries.

When data from Phase I were compared to Phase II, all services were supplied from fewer sites in the random sample than in the nominated libraries, as Table V shows.

[INSERT TABLE V HERE]

Still Special Resources, emanating from 79 percent of the random sample, once again topped the list of services with Extension, offered by 59 percent, in second place. Further, in the random sample, Special Services were absent in the majority of cases, although they were offered at more sites than Group Programs. In fact, Group Programs outside the library were found in 38 percent less of the libraries offering service in Phase II than in Phase I.

When the broad categories were combined, for the National Survey the average number of services calculated per library was 2.46. In Phase I for the nominated libraries in the Update that figure rose to 3.39. However, in Phase II, the mean number of services computed per library for the random sample was 2.36, closer to the average for the libraries nominated in 1971 than those nominated in 1985.

Services Initiated and Terminated. To discern trends in the growth of services since the National Survey was completed, data from both Phases I and II were analyzed by period of initiation and termination. Table VI indicates the results.

[INSERT TABLE VI HERE]

Based on data from 349, or 65 percent of the total libraries reporting older adult services, their development had its bonanza in the 1970s, when over 2,440 new programs were established. The termination of programs, minimal in the seventies, increased over 50 percent in the eighties. Among the reasons given for ending services, lack of funding and lack of staff were named most frequently. Close behind them, however, were failing interest on the part

of older adults and, as a corollary, insufficient use.

Older Adults Served. Not all libraries that offered services supplied information on their use. For the Update 242, or 45 percent, did so; another 51 indicated that they did not keep statistics on older adult users as a distinct group; comparable figures were not reported in the National Survey. Data available from Phase I, however, indicated a good deal of growth since the 1971 National Survey, as Table VII demonstrates.

[INSERT TABLE VII HERE]

Although Extension still served the largest number of older adults, it was not by such a wide margin. Circulation of Special Resources accounted for the greatest percentage of growth. While 15 percent more libraries in Phase I offered group programs outside of the library for older adults than they did in 1971, their volume of use is greater than 3.5 times that of programs offered on premises.

When data from the nominated libraries were compared to the random sample Extension still reached the highest number of elders with Special Resources close behind. Contrary to Phase I the figures supplied in Phase II showed less older adults served via Group Programs outside the library than those offered from within. This was not surprising since far fewer programs offered outside the library were reported in Phase II. However, data for Special Services indicated extremely slim use in view of the number of the Phase II libraries reporting offerings in this area.

When the number of older adults utilizing each of the five types of services offered by libraries is tabulated as a percentage of the total older adult population in the libraries' collective service areas, however, it is apparent that growth in use is, to a large extent, a reflection of the growth in the number of elders in the population. The market penetration in Phase I reached is on the average no greater than the four percent reported by the 1971

survey. While Extension Services and Special Services attract five percent of the potential older adults, Programs Outside the Library and Special Services capture four percent. Programs Within the Library reach a mere two percent.

From the data supplied in Phase II, the random sample showed a higher market penetration in all cases; still on the average, less than seven percent of the elder population were reached by services, as Table VII also depicts.

Service Promotion. Although the National Survey indicated that few libraries had attempted to make potential users aware of available services through radio, television and newspapers, no specific data were collected on the dissemination of programmatic information. For both phases of the Update respondents were asked to check the vehicles utilized for promotion. The results are also shown in Table VIII.

[INSERT TABLE VIII HERE]

Of the 293 libraries supplying one or more services to older adults in Phase I, only 139, or 47 percent, made any effort along these lines. When present, brochures, flyers, and newsletters distributed from the library, reported by 128, or 44 percent of those providing services, were the most frequent means of communication with intended audiences. Newspaper articles were reported by 109, or 37 percent; radio spots by 84, or 29 percent; and television announcements by 42, or 14 percent. Ninety-six respondents, or 32 percent, distribute program information through agencies in the local aging network, that is, through those social service organizations with a mandate to provide services for older adults. One library cited direct mail campaigns for these purposes.

The percentages of libraries in Phase II offering services that promoted them through the five media closely approximated those in Phase I. However, here newspapers--the least expensive method of informing the public of offerings--were most frequently used.

FINDINGS: ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT

One of the major conclusions of the National Survey was that the development of library services for older adults must be accorded greater priority by the public library. A number of ways of defining priority level, which included measuring funding, staffing, administrative patterns for service, and perceived barriers--introduced in the earlier study--were repeated in the Update. The most direct asked respondents, in Section VI of the questionnaire, to indicate the relative rank assigned to service development for four age groups--children, young adults, adults, and older adults.

Priority for Service

Among public libraries in the National Survey, the aging most frequently received the lowest priority. Adults were ranked highest by 58 percent of all libraries. Children were assigned the second or first priority by 81 percent. Young adults were placed third or higher by 70 percent. Older adults were accorded the lowest priority by 62 percent with only three percent ranking them first.

The National Survey reported insufficient information to construct statistical tests determining differences between the earlier and current research. A new age group, Preschool children, enjoying more recent public library attention than older adults, was added to the priority list to get some measure of whether the low status of elder services was based primarily on their comparatively short longevity. The assumption was also made that within the data collected for the Update Phase I there might be a difference in the priorities of libraries with newly established services for older adults and those that were more longstanding.

To test the hypothesis that there were significant differences in Priorities based upon longevity, a two-tailed t-test for independent samples was performed at the .05 level for each of the five priorities demonstrated by the five age groups: Preschool, up to age 5; Children, ages 6 to 12; Young Adults, ages 13 to 20; Adults, ages 21 to 64; and Older Adults, ages 65+. The analysis produced the results shown in Table IX.

[INSERT TABLE IX HERE]

The null hypotheses were rejected for four of the five age groups; there were no significant differences in priorities except for older adult service. The mean score for those nominated libraries included in both the National Survey and the Update Phase I was 3.99 as compared to 3.56 for those appearing in the Update Phase I only. Data indicate that while longer-lived programs placed a somewhat higher priority on older adult services, it was not enough to change overall comparative rankings.

To determine whether there were significant differences between the nominated libraries of Phase I and the random sample of Phase II, a second two-tailed t-test for independent samples was conducted at the .05 level for the five categories of age. Table X illustrates the findings.

[INSERT TABLE X HERE]

This time the null hypothesis was rejected in three of five cases. However, the differences were in the responses on preschoolers, young adults and adults, not in the responses on elder services. The mean score for the random sample was 3.72 as compared to 3.82 for all Phase I, nominated libraries. While the nominated libraries had a somewhat higher priority for older adults, their comparative ranking remained low. Specific ratings for Phases I and II are shown in frequencies and percentages in Table XI.

[INSERT TABLE XI HERE]

In Phase I, with 257, or 81 percent of the respondents reporting, adults were highest most often; first priority was assigned by 50 percent of the libraries. Children were second or first in 57 percent of the cases. Preschoolers were assigned the third priority or above by 83 percent, a higher rating than elders. Then the rankings were inverted from those accorded in the 1971 Study--older adults scored higher than young adults, with the latter placed last by 51 percent. In Phase I of the Update older adults were ranked in fourth place by 39 percent and in the last place by 31 percent.

In Phase II, with 215, or 79 percent, of the respondents reporting, preschool children outpaced adults in the first priority with children in the first or second spot 60 percent of the time. Here adults were reduced to third place with 76 percent assigning them to that priority or above. Young adults came in fourth or fifth among 69 percent of the respondents and, while overall older adults ranked fourth, here as in the nominated libraries, 30 percent placed them last. A total of 66 percent of the respondents voted elder services into the two bottom rung priorities. At the same time in Phase II libraries, as in Phase I, only 4 percent of the respondents ranked older adults first.

Financial Support

Information on funding, considered the major indicator of organizational support, was gathered in the National Survey and in the Update. In the National Survey it was determined that public libraries allocated $957,719, or less than one percent of their budgets--about 0.4 percent to be exact--for elder service. The study concluded that fiscal resources were disproportionately low when compared to the size of the population represented by older adults and recommended that libraries seek a broader funding base, especially through grants from philanthropic organizations.

For the Update, Phase I in Section V, budgetary allocations and sources of funding, together with their proportionate contribution to the provision of library services for older adults were computed and compared to data from the National Survey. Only 73, or 27 percent of the 266 libraries responding in 1971, specifically budgeted funds for the aging. In the 1981 Illinois state study only 19, or 5 percent, earmarked funds for that purpose. In the Update Phase I 98, or 31 percent of the respondents, did so. For the Update Phase II the comparable figure was 104, or 38 percent of the respondents. It appears that public libraries are using program budgeting to a minimal degree and that budgets for older adult services may be scattered in other fiscal categories. In addition, funds that provide significant offerings for older adults were excluded from the amounts reported by the stringency of the operational definition of service for older adults.

Within these limitations a compilation of all sources of funding identified in the Update is presented in Table XII; no comparable data is available for the 1971 Study.

[INSERT TABLE XII HERE]

The total allocated by the respondents for in the Update Phase I nominated libraries was $2,831,878. Thirty-five percent was derived from local taxation, 62 percent from state and federal grants, and only 3 percent from philanthropy. Two awards accounted for 88 percent of the money declared under other federal grants. Similarly, the only corporate contribution recorded, one of $50,000, made up 59 percent of the $84,957 total for philanthropy. There were also minor gifts from community fraternal and civic organizations, as well as donations from individuals and Friends of the Library. In the Update Phase II, the total budgeted by respondents from the random sample was $1,156,957. Forty-nine percent came from local taxes; 45 percent from state and federal

grants; and 6 percent from philanthropy. While corporate giving was received by only three sites, 37 recorded private contributions. Table XIII provides a comparative overview of funding patterns found by the National Survey and the Update Phases I and II.

[INSERT TABLE XIII HERE]

Among the three studies there were remarkable variations in funding sources. Between 1971 and the Update Phase I federal and local sources showed substantial differences in total contributions. Whereas federal sources accounted for 59 percent of the fiscal pie in 1971, they supplied 49 percent in the Update Phase I. LSCA, which provided 80 percent of that amount in the first case, declined to 63 percent in the second. Funding under the Older Americans Act dropped from 15 to 4 percent of all federal sources as well. While local taxation contributed 24 percent in 1971, in Phase I it had grown to 35 percent. Philanthropy and gifts from private donors accounted for three percent in Phase I, a smaller amount than they had in 1971, when they were at the minimal level of seven percent.

In comparing Phase I and II libraries, funding patterns presented a third picture. Federal sources declined further, accounting for less than half the amount received by the nominated libraries. Other than monies from LSCA, federal funding was trivial. Local taxation contributed 14 percent more in Phase II. Philanthropy, while still less than the figure found in the National Survey, was 50 percent higher than in Phase I. Since state library agencies and the federal government are both dispensers of LSCA funds, it is possible in this tabulation that some LSCA monies were credited as originating from the state government.

When the budget for older adults services was tabulated as a percentage of the budgets for those nominated libraries supplying data in Phase I, the

$2,831,878 was determined to be 1.2 percent of the total, an improvement over the .4 percent found in 1971. In Phase II, for the random sample of libraries the $1,156,957 was 2 percent of the total budget and only 41 percent of the amount in the Phase I libraries, even though more had reported figures in Phase II.

Administrative Patterns

The priority accorded services for older adults was further evaluated by the number of staff charged with supplying those services and the administrative structure in place to support them, as indicated by data collected in Section IV of the questionnaire.

Staffing. For the National Survey information on the full time equivalent staff was gathered on the 20 libraries with the highest number of older adults in their service areas. Why that group was selected was unexplained, but it can be conjectured that more inclusive data may not have been forthcoming, since in the Update respondents often indicated that record-keeping is not usually organized around adult age groups.

Of a total of 19,957 full time equivalent employees in the 20 libraries, 262 or 1.3 percent were designated as specifically serving the aging. The evidence led to the conclusion that staffing was minimal and a recommendation that the interests of older adults should be represented by a member of the staff assigned responsibility on a full or part time basis, depending on the size of the library and the size of the older adult population in the primary service area.

What evidence did the Update uncover of growth in staff? In Phase I, 172 libraries of all sizes were able to supply information--54 percent of the respondents; in Phase II, that figure was 108, or 39 percent of the respondents. From the total workforce of 13,168 employees in Phase I, 211, or

1.6 percent, were allocated to serving the older adult. For the Phase II libraries from a smaller total workforce of 3,218 employees, 97 or 3 percent were reported as serving elders--a higher figure than the exemplary group. Because of the disparity in the way in which the data were collected, it is impossible to conclude definitely that this represented an improvement over the National Survey. Only when consideration is given to the fact that, in the 1971 study, the findings were based on large libraries and the figures probably overestimated staffing in exemplar libraries in general, is there some foundation for pronouncing limited progress.

Organizational Structure. In 1971, when respondents were asked to name the primary library department responsible for providing the four major categories of older adult services, it was found typically that they were located in Extension and Outreach. Services to older adults were not regarded as a distinct program, but were considered part of adult services. Most of the programs in which elders participated were planned for the general adult audience and not for a particular age segment. The absence of such programming was considered the result of the traditional philosophy held by librarians that the public library should provide services of universal scope and appeal. Nor had libraries assigned responsibility for administering and coordinating library services for older adults; organizational structure had not been established.

The National Survey recommended that to elevate library service to elders to a higher, more visible priority, older adults as a group should be considered a discrete program entity with a coordinator appointed to ensure that their special needs were identified and opportunities to serve them were met in a way that encouraged orderly, systematic development and implementation of library services.

What influence did the National Survey's recommendations have on administrative patterns over the ensuing decade? In the Update, when, through questions in Section IV, respondents were once again asked to supply the primary department responsible for older adult services, 43 different locations were listed. The major categories of service were often divided among four separate administrative units with no organizational mechanism in place to coordinate them. Among the units most frequently named in both phases by libraries were:

	Phase I	Phase II
Extension	84	61
Outreach	63	39
Adult Services	62	28
Information Services	28	5
Community Services	20	3
Special Services	10	2

Once again Extension and Outreach headed the list. The remaining sites were indigenous to one location. Of the 318 nominated libraries, only one reported a distinct programmatic entity--Older Adult Services, headed by a coordinator--a Senior Services Specialist. In the random sample only one of the 275 libraries reported having an Older Adult Services Coordinator; this one operating out of Extension. Obviously, in addition to continued minimal funding, the Update demonstrated that responsibility for staffing, coordinating, planning, and evaluating services to older adults had not been clearly and formally recognized yet in the organization of the public library.

Cooperation with Community Organizations

The National Survey concluded that most libraries cooperated with other community organizations serving older adults. At least one relationship

was listed by 168, or 63 percent of the respondents, and an average of 2.7 per library were discovered overall. The study recommended that public libraries take the initiative in strengthening services to older adults further by establishing cooperative relationships with other local agencies serving elders and by maintaining joint programs.

For the Update, in Section VII of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to note any associations that might currently exist by checking the type of agency with which the collaboration was shared and then briefly describing it. The results are recorded in Table XIV.

[INSERT TABLE XIV HERE]

In the Update Phase I, the number of libraries reporting at least one relationship was raised to 208, or 65 percent of the respondents, with an average of 3.4 relationships recorded per library. In Phase II, 159 libraries, or 58 percent, reported at least one relationship, with an average of 2.9 relationships per library. Three studies over a 12 year period--the National Survey, the Illinois Survey and the Update Phase I--had all supported the contention that about two-thirds of all public libraries do cooperate with other organizations to serve older adults but that about one-third do not. For the Phase II random sample that figure was less than two-thirds, but well over the majority.

It is not surprising that agencies in the social service aging network were named frequently as partners, or that together with nursing homes and senior centers, they comprised the bulk of the list. Twenty-six additional types of agencies were named under Other, including:

Coalitions and Council--by five;

Older adult civic and social groups and retirement homes--by four;

Hospitals and consumer agencies--by three;

Adult Daycare Centers--by two; and

Corporations and the Internal Revenue Service--by one each.

In the main, the relationships described programs and services jointly sponsored, provided within or outside the library, such as mutually reciprocal information exchanges, service promotion, and library deposit collections in the agencies. Some more unique cooperative enterprises were also mentioned. With social service agencies, libraries produced and administered: Grants for service programs; conferences; networks for coordinated service delivery; and Councils for integrated program planning. Social service agencies supplied volunteers to the library and also the funds to employ older adults. Health care agencies collaborated in funding patient libraries, delivering materials to patients, and providing transportation to the library. Churches also jointly produced grants, and provided names for homebound services and screening for consumer and welfare information. In the main, fraternal organizations and unions contributed money, but they also supplied volunteers.

Perceived Barriers to Older Adult Services

When respondents were asked to list the major constraints to services for older adults, the National Survey indicated that five were supplied most frequently:

Available funding--by 95 percent;

Available staff--by 32 percent;

Transportation for older adults--by 16 percent;

Interest on the part of librarians--by 11 percent;

Interest on the part of older adults--by 6 percent.

For the Update 14 constraints were detailed in Section VIII of the questionnaire and respondents were asked to denote the most significant, significant, and least significant barriers to the library's capacity to serve the

needs of older adults. The findings are tabulated in frequency and percentage in Table XV.

[INSERT TABLE XV HERE]

Once again, since the information reported by the National Survey was minimal, to make comparisons with the nominated libraries of the Update it was assumed that within the data collected in Phase I, the libraries that were included in both the earlier and the current study would have resolved more of the constraints to program development than the group added for the Update Phase I only. To test the hypotheses that there were significant differences in Constraints among Phase I libraries based on longevity, two-tailed t-tests for independent samples were performed at the .05 level for each of the 14 variables. The analysis produced the results shown in Table XVI.

[INSERT TABLE XVI HERE]

The only barrier showing a significant difference was lack of staff training, given a higher score by libraries newer to serving older adults. Since, according to interviews from the National Survey, the ongoing interest and motivation of librarians is aroused by exposure to the special needs and problems of older adults and through contacts with knowledgeable individuals who can help librarians improve their skills in service provision, education for service to older adults becomes crucial.

Once again funding, with the highest mean score, was determined the most significant barrier; it was followed by philosophy of service, library priorities, transportation for elders, staff availability, lack of staff training opportunities, lack of older adult interest, and lack of staff interest in that order. All of the top constraints revealed by the National Survey were still perceived as barriers in Phase I of the Update.

To determine whether there were significant differences between the nominated libraries of Phase I and the random sample of Phase II, a second two-tailed t-test for independent samples was conducted at the .05 level for the 14 constraints. Table XVII illustrates the findings.

[INSERT TABLE XVII HERE]

In every case but one there was a significant difference between perceptions of barriers to elder service on the part of the respondents from Phase I nominated libraries and those in the Phase II random sample. The Phase II libraries found philosophy of service a lesser problem than those in Phase I. Constraints were scored higher by Phase II libraries than by those in Phase I, i.e., the random sample perceived them as greater barriers. Both groups placed lack of staff training opportunities, inadequate transportation for older adults, library priorities and lack of staff interest among the greatest constraints. But Phase II libraries added awareness of older adult needs, inadequate publicity and architectural barriers. Three additional constraints surfaced under Other: Lack of space, the perception that older adults dislike being categorized, and the large number of services for elders offered by other agencies. There was far greater congruity between respondents to the National Survey and the Update Phase I than there was between the two phases of the Update.

Older Adults as Library Resources

As a final evaluation of organizational support, measures were taken to determine whether the public library has focused on the older adult as a resource. In the period since the National Survey was completed, there has been less emphasis on the problems of aging and more on the older adult as a national asset. In 1971, of the 244 respondents 137, or 56 percent,

reported employing a total of 517 elders for an average of 3.8 per library. At the same time 66 libraries, or 27 percent, had 363 older adult volunteers with an average of 5.5 per library. The National Survey recommended that both groups should be increased, but stressed expanded use of older adults as paid employees, particularly for work with their peers to take advantage of their personal knowledge of the needs and interest of the older audience.

To determine what progress had occurred, respondents were asked, in Section IX of the Update, if they utilized persons 65+ as employees and as volunteers, and to specify the number in each category. Table XVIII shows the results and compares them to the earlier findings.

[INSERT TABLE XVIII HERE]

In the Update Phase I, 166, or 52 percent, reported employing a total of 560, for an average of 3.4 per library, which represented a loss rather than a gain. In Phase II, 218 libraries, or 79 percent, reported employing 270 elders for an average of 1.2 per library, lower still than the libraries nominated for this study. Volunteers presented a brighter picture. The number of libraries in Phase I with elder volunteers increased to 183, or close to 60 percent of the respondents, who had on roll a total of 1,861 volunteers for an average of 10.2 per library. In Phase II, 227 libraries, or 83 percent, had a total of 1,339 volunteers for an average of 5.9 per library, a figure closer to the 1971 Study than the Update, Phase I. It appears that elder employees are generally persons who have not as yet retired. There is no evidence that those 65+ are hired by libraries, however; elder volunteers enjoy more popularity.

DISCUSSION

While there has been some limited progress in public library service for older adults over the past decade, there is little evidence that they are receiving the attention they warrant, attention in keeping with the growth in the size of the elder population and in the national interest in the aging. In fact, the results of Phases I and II of the 1986 Update are remarkably similar to those of the National Survey, completed in 1971.

> Two-thirds of the public libraries give a low priority to program development for elders, when compared to other groups in the population.
>
> Funds for services to older adults comprise no more than two percent of the budgets of these public libraries.
>
> Staffing constitutes less than three percent of the available workforce.
>
> On the average seven percent of the nation's elders are reached by library service, as defined by the study.
>
> The majority of public libraries have older adult volunteers and employees, although the proportion of the latter is decreasing.
>
> The majority work with other community agencies in the aging network.
>
> Services to older adults are not generally considered distinct program entities and there is no administrative structure for their overall coordination.

The results of Phase I of the Update--where slightly more than one percent of the budgets and less than two percent of the staff supported services that reached only four percent of the target audience--were highly similar to those of the National Survey completed in 1971. While in Phase II a lower percent of the sample offered any elder services, in the main, program concentrations were in the same major categories as those of the Phase I libraries. The volume of services found in Phase II were closer to the average for libraries nominated in 1971 than those nominated in 1986.

The random sample received a greater proportion of their support from local taxation and local support; they cited more constraints that acted as barriers to improving services and they reported that elder services were the fourth or fifth priority in a field of five possible age range services.

As in the National Survey, libraries in urban and suburban communities were far more likely to develop such programs than their rural counterparts, despite the fact that the latter environment is where the greatest proportion of older adults make their homes.

But having a library convenient to them is more than a matter of physical location, it is a factor of total accessibility which is strongly influenced by older adults' perceptions of the local library's openness and acceptance, a kind of psychological convenience. That convenience is attained in large part by the implementation of services that are directed at client needs. Progress, then, must be measured not only by an increase in volume of service, but also by whether added offerings are responsive to the elder audience as it is presently constituted.

The great majority of today's elderly Americans are the wealthiest, best fed, best housed, healthiest, most self-reliant older population in history [9]. Most live in the community, with only five percent in institutions. They have a steadily rising level of educational attainment, although it is still lower than younger populations. However, not all older adults are part of the new breed. The expected doubling of the elder population within the next 50 years assures the continued existence of subgroups that will require various forms of assistance in order to maintain their independence. These subgroups are drawn disproportionately from segments of the older population that are expected to grow most rapidly in the future--minorities and women, particularly those who live alone. At the same time there has been a steady decline in older workers, even though they have expressed

considerable sentiment about remaining in the labor force on a part-time basis after retirement, preferably in a second career [1,16,26]. Their psychological survival has earned the focus of social gerontologists, since the failure to provide elders with meaningful social roles, their isolation from the general population, the propagation of ageism--the stereotypical labeling of older adults and the tendency to deny their individuality--and segregation, are recognized as causing extensive damage to their self-esteem, rendering them less able to act in their own behalf.

Service Provision

With that backdrop, what improvement has been documented in older adult programs? The major focus of services has not changed much in the past decade, even though there has been significant change in the audience for which they are intended. The thrust remains reaching concentrations of older adults through services for the homebound, institutionalized, and impaired with little attention paid to the new breed crossing the 65+ threshold. A major effort must be directed at matching the strength of these traditional services with programs for mobile, healthy elders.

In spite of evidence that supports a focus on educational services for older adults, the Update found sparse attention paid to them. The Russell Sage Foundation has documented the need by demonstrating that, next to financial reasons, lack of education was the most frequently mentioned barrier to the elder's sense of fulfillment [28]. DeCrow has documented the potential audience by illustrating the older adult's increasing interest in lifelong learning [29]. The public library has a role to play in a wide range of educational services, among them older adult basic education and educational brokering, and, equally as important, in acting as a resource for the older adult threading from first career to second. Since the same strong case

has been made for information services [19], it was equally disappointing that less than three percent of this exemplar sample had instituted such programs for the aging network. New on the horizon in this decade is the recognition that better services for elders depends on better informed service providers.

Perhaps most disappointing, however, was the lack of attention paid to aging awareness, for surely Ferstl's work [13] proved that it is needed as much by library professionals as by the general public. In his study of public librarians, he found that, while they supported the principles found in the ALA statement of Library Responsibility to the Aging, there was not a significant difference between their attitudes and the common stereotypes of the American public toward older adults. Aging awareness is needed to disrupt patterns that cause us to grow old prejudiced against ourselves. The public library must become a more visible force in the ongoing campaign to dispel the myths of ageism.

While the list of services compiled by the Update is in itself a useful compendium of possibilities for those libraries that would initiate older adult services, only the more traditional are widely available. The voluminous accounts of innovation, found in the professional literature, are clearly models for emulation and imitation, not an accurate reflection of the state of professional practice.

One of the reasons put forth most frequently for the public library's failure to attract more of the potential market for older adult services is lack of interest on the part of elders; that in turn may be a reflection of the fare they have become accustomed to expect from the library. Deserving equal attention is the lack of promotion the services receive. Libraries will need to initiate thoughtfully planned, comprehensive promotion programs

based on data that identifies optimum communication channels for reaching the segments of the elder audience for which the services are targeted. Certainly, the aging network is used too infrequently as a point of distribution. If the library remains the single avenue for dissemination of information on services for elders, then the audience will probably not grow considerably beyond current users.

Organizational Support

The fact that the vast majority of libraries consigned older adults services to the lowest priority ranges was corroborated in the general level discovered in the remaining measures of organizational support.

The philosophical conflict, made apparent in the information gathered on barriers to the library's capacity to serve older adults, demonstrated that the service to all philosophy of the public library is among its greatest strengths and at the same time among its enduring weaknesses in regard to serving elders. It leads to their inclusion as users with no differentiation by age, but it also restrains public libraries from defining the older adult as one of their major markets and targeting specific programs to them in abundance. Librarians who perceive the import of services based on the developmental needs of children, young adults and adults fail to realize that such a perspective is essential for older adults as well. Monroe has provided a professional framework for building services around the developmental tasks of aging [20], but too few librarians know about and use them. This is one of the instances in which the need for educating all public library staff members in serving older adults became explicit.

It can be surmised that the effects of the philosophical argument have been at least in part responsible for the fact that, a decade after the National Survey's chilling indictment, there is still no evidence of major

improvement in organization for elder services. They remain understaffed, uncoordinated, and scattered among many locations and task groups in both exemplary and representative. While not all libraries may be able to support a specialist in services for older adults, at least administrative responsibility should be assigned to the portfolio of one highly placed administrator. There is still a need for older adult services to be recognized as a distinct program entity to encourage assessing the needs of older adults, establishing objectives to meet those needs, developing and implementing programs, and evaluating results for their effectiveness. Such a switch should help to alleviate the view of elder services as a series of special events, sporadically initiated and unrelated to a well-conceived plan of action.

Since the Update discovered an increasing tendency for elder services to be terminated with no concomitant increase in their initiation, a poor but improving situation could deteriorate rapidly. The reason given most frequently for termination was a decrease in the budget, which accentuates the chronically tenuous fiscal health of library services for older adults.

The funding issue is a complex one. Of course, new monies are needed, since entrenched, viable, and competitive interests are firmly in place within the library that are unlikely to encourage a realignment of funding priorities in the near future. One encouraging note was found in the fiscal dilemma, however. The local library is picking up an increasing share of the costs for older adult services. Federal grants are often distributed to start and operate programs of service for elders for a fixed period with the intention that funds beyond that period will be provided by local sources. It appears that national incentives have been successful.

But coalition building at the national, state and local level remains essential if public libraries are to receive the funding that is needed.

To date the aging network has overlooked the contribution that public libraries can make to services they initiate. Library leadership must stress collaboration through which libraries can project the services, resources, and professional expertise they possess that are important to serving the older adult, so that stronger linkages can be formed with older adult service providers.

A bright spot in both the National Survey and the Update was that public libraries are cooperating with other agencies to serve older adults. In most cases in 1986, however, the relationships reported were still informal arrangements frequently resulting from person-to-person negotiations which took place among individuals known to each other. Collaborative mobilization of resources for a more comprehensive system of service involves more than informal relations. In fact, the absence of a formal structure for interaction imposes a barrier to the ultimate aim of collaboration--coordinated service delivery in which clients are considered as whole persons and services integrated to meet their needs.

Activating this new delivery system in a meaningful sense will take a good deal of effort where turf is second to service. In fact, since funding for older adult programs was cited as the major barrier to progress, coordinated service delivery might provide some of the answers. Public libraries and key social service agencies together can explore the means by which the importance of local funding for coordinated information dissemination can be communicated to community officials. Budgetary support should also come to the library from agencies that value the services the library brings to the collaborative endeavor.

Serving older adults is an expensive business for libraries and other agencies and a duplicative one as well. Coordinated service delivery is one of the most cost-effective means for devising fiscally spare but responsive

programs. Before it is widely adopted, however, substantial incentives are needed at the state and federal level to provide more widespread models demonstrating its benefits.

In 1970, sociologist Max Kaplan foresaw a virtual revolution as society began to concentrate on the older adult as a resource [31]. If the public library is any indicator, that revolution has been slow to arrive. While there was a major increase in libraries with older adult volunteers between 1971 and 1986, the picture for the elder worker was not as bright. Older adults want part-time hours and public libraries have part-time jobs. The library would benefit from the older adult as a liaison with aging agencies, presenting intergenerational and other programs, assisting with homebound and institutional deliveries, advertising and promoting library service.

Although it was made explicit in the inventory of constraints, throughout the results of the Update there was evidence of the need for greater attention to older adult services in professional education. It was apparent in the lack of originality and responsiveness in the services available and in the hint that unrealized ageism might be influencing the service priority accorded elders. In the main, the Update was not encouraging. Even exemplar public libraries were too frequently not fully aware of their elder population, not cognizant of the network of agencies providing services to them, and not fully promoting their services in a way that attracted the maximum potential audience.

The Future

This study indicated that libraries in the random sample did not, in the main, have elder services that were as highly developed as those of the nominated agencies. On the average, libraries in the random sample also had lower budgets, fewer staff members and served smaller populations. Since

continues with the publication of the Symposium Proceedings in 1988. In addition, an article has already appeared in the Spring 1987 issue of Library Quarterly, which reported on Phase I of the study.

For the future, the report will be reduced to manuscript size and submitted to Library Journal, the most widely read publication in librarianship. Finally, although not a part of the proposed work under contract, that manuscript will be sent to 10 educators and practitioners and to the Symposium speakers to amplify the recommended action agenda.

It should be noted that both contract targets were produced on a grant of less than $25,000. We believe that in the final analysis Rutgers School of Communication, Information and Library Studies' Research Bureau has set forth at reasonable costs quality products which have important implications for the field. It is our intent to continue to do so in the future.

None of this could have been accomplished without the grant from the USDE. Once again librarianship has been moved forward by the work of the Library Development Staff at the OERI. The profession has much for which to thank them.

nominated libraries were not representative, it is reasonable to assume that their selection was likely based on state and federal knowledge of service provision developed from grant funding.

Further federal incentives, particularly through LSCA, were demonstrated to be successful in stimulating the initiation of services later supported by local taxation. At this juncture grant programs targeted specifically to small and medium size libraries where services do not exist would be fruitful. The focus, however, must shift from extension services and special resources to education, information, aging awareness, coordinated service delivery and programs for older adult service providers. As the patterns of service initiation and termination indicate, substantial support at the federal level is imperative to maintain any momentum in service development.

For the future, a national action agenda on library services for older adults must be forged for the next decade based on expert opinions from the university and the field. The organizations surveyed in the Update provide ample evidence that public library services, although improved since 1971, have a long way to go before they are part of the growing national movement to recognize and encourage the potential of older adults.

Dissemination

The grant proposal set out to meet two major goals: 1) to complete a research investigation that would set the groundwork for an action agenda for the future; and 2) to offer a symposium to disseminate the results of the study. Both have been accomplished. The Annual Alumni-Faculty Symposium was on Information and Aging, and as indicated in earlier reports, 125 persons were attracted to the daylong session in which this and other research addressed the topic of library services for older adults. Dissemination of the results

REFERENCES

1. Allan, Carole and Brotman, Herman B. Chartbook on Aging in America. A Background Report for the 1981 White House Conference on Aging. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Administration on Aging, 1981.

2. "Facts About Older Americans, 1983-1984." Unpublished report from the Administration on Aging, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, n.d.

3. Brotman, Herman B. "Every Ninth American." Report to the Special Committee on Aging; United States Senate, 1983.

4. Moore, Bessie Bochm and Carr-Young, Christina. "Library/Information Services and the Nation's Elderly," Journal of the American Society for Information Science 36 (6 1985): 364-368.

5. Casey, Genevieve. Library Services for the Aging. Hamden, Connecticut: Shoestring Press, 1984.

6. Matthews, Virginia. "Libraries: Aid to Life Satisfaction for Older Women," Paper commissioned for the 1981 White House Conference on Aging. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies, September, 1981.

7. Turock, Betty J. "Public Library Services for Aging in the Eighties," Paper commissioned for the 1981 White House Conference on Aging. U.S. Department of Education; Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies, September, 1981.

8. White House Conference on Library and Information Services. Information for the 1980s. Final Report. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Library and Information Science, 1979.

9. White House Conference on Aging: Final Report. Toward a National Policy on Aging. 2 vols. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Administration on Aging, 1982.

10. "National Survey of Library Services to the Aging: Final Report." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology, 1972. ED 067-521.

11. Illinois State Library Task Force for Library Service to the Aging. Service for the Elderly in Illinois Public Libraries: A Survey Report no. 6). Springfield, Illinois: Illinois State Library, 1981.

12. Abbott, Susan. Comprehensive Service Delivery. Washington, D.C.: National Council on the Aging, 1982.

13. Ferstl, Kenneth. "Public Libraries and Services to the Aging: A Study of Attitudes." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1977.

14. Fowles, Donald. "The Changing Older Population," Aging (May/June 1983): 6-27.

15. Hales, Celia. "Planning for the Information Needs of the Aging: A Delphi Study." Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1982.

16. Kamin, Judith. How Older Adults Use Books and the Public Library: A Review of the Literature. Urbana, Illinois: Occasional paper no. 165, Graduate School of Library Science University of Illinois, 1984.

17. Kanner, Elliott E. "The Impact of Gerontological Concepts on Principles of Librarianship." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1972.

18. Lucas, Linda S. "Reading Interests, Life Interests, and Life-Style," Public Library Quarterly 3 (Winter 1982): 11-18.

19. Lunin, Lois F. "Wanted: Information About and for the Aging," Bulletin of the American Society for Information Sciences 5 (October 1978): 14-17.

20. Monroe, Margaret and Rubine, Rhea. The Challenge of Aging: A Bibliography. Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, 1983.

21. Older Volunteers: A Fact Sheet. Washington, D.C.: National Council on the Aging, 1982.

22. Osborn, Robert. Facts and Myths About Aging. Washington, D.C.: National Council on the Aging, 1981.

23. Sheppard, Harold L., Ed. Aging in the Eighties. Washington, D.C.: National Council on the Aging, 1981.

24. Strategies for Linking the Generations: A Report of the 1981 White House Conference on Aging Mini-Conference, 1982.

25. Taeuber, Cynthia M. "America in Transition: An Aging Society," Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 128, September 1983: 1-28.

26. Turock, Betty J. Serving the Older Adult: A Guide to Library Programs and Information Sources. New York: R.R. Bowker, 1982.

27. Ventura-Merkel, Catherine. Education for Older Adults: A Catalogue of Program Profiles. Washington, D.C.: National Council on the Aging, 1983.

28. Statistical Abstracts of the United States 1986, 106th ed. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census, 1986: 26-27.

29. Hiemstia, Roger. "The Older Adult's Learning Projects." Educational Gerontology 1 (October-December 1976): 331-341.

30. DeCrow, Roger. New Learning For Older Americans. Washington, D.C.: Adult Education Assoc. of the USA.

31. Kaplan, Max. "Leisure and the Elderly." In Handbook to the Modern World. London: Anthony Bland, 1970.

APPENDIX

NATIONAL STUDY OF LIBRARY SERVICES TO THE AGING - UPDATE 1985

QUESTIONNAIRE--PUBLIC LIBRARIES

I. Identification

Name of Library_____

Address_____City_____State_____

Name and Title of Person Reporting_____

Study Definitions

The following definitions are used for this study.

Older Adults. Persons who are 65 years or older.

Extension of Library Services. Library sponsored activities that increase access to materials for elders who cannot conveniently use library facilities because of mobility barriers, e.g., bookmobiles, homebound services, sub-branches, and deposit collections in housing projects for the aged, etc.

Programs for Older Adults. Special programs that are held inside or outside the library. Group programs held within the library include clubs, films, book talks, etc. Group programs held outside the library include clubs, films, book talks, etc. offered in other organizations like in senior centers, nursing homes, churches, etc. or through the mass media, such as radio and television.

Special Resources. Materials and adjunct equipment for older adults who experience disabilities that interfere with their use of standard media, e.g. large-print books, talking books, reading aids, magnifying equipment, close captioned viewing adaptors, Kurzweil machines, etc.

Special Services. Library sponsored activities targeted for older adults that amplify traditional services, e.g. information and referral (I & R), oral history, lifelong learning, etc.

II. General Information on Your Library

1. What is the total population of the library's primary service area?_____
2. What is the number of persons 65 years or older in the primary service area?_____
   (If you do not have this information at hand, please contact your local, county or state planning agency for it. This information is vital to the success of the study.
3. What is the number of full-time equivalent employees in the library?_____
4. What is the total budget of the library for the current fiscal year?_____

III. Programs or Services Which Your Library Provides to Older Adults

For the purpose of this study, programs or services to older adults include those that are: (1) offered specially for the aging--the well, shut-in, and institutionalized--as well as (2) services in which 50% or more of the participants are 65+ years. These programs or services should not include regular or routine services provided on an individual basis, such as general circulation and reference services. In the questions below, you are asked to give information concerning your library's programs or services from 1972 to the present.

Please indicate programs of service offered older adults by checking the appropriate space to the left of the item. Then, to the right, place the inclusive dates of the program; if terminated, state the date and reason for termination.

		Year Initiated	Date Terminated	Reason for Termination
1.	Extension			
a.	_____ Delivery to Institutions			
b.	_____ Bookmobile			
	1) ____ Standard entrance			
	2) ____ Hydraulic lift			
c.	_____ Deposit Collections			
	1) ____ Senior Centers			
	2) ____ Senior Housing			
	3) ____ Nursing Homes			
d.	_____ Books and media by mail			
e.	_____ Homebound services			
f.	_____ Other (List)			
	1) _____			
	2) _____			
2.	Special Resources			
a.	_____ Large print books			
b.	_____ Talking books			
c.	_____ Magnifying devices			
d.	_____ Ceiling projectors			
e.	_____ Page turners			
f.	_____ Kurzweil Reading Machines			
g.	_____ Telecommunication devices for the deaf			
h.	_____ Close captioned viewing adaptors			
i.	_____ Other (List)			
	1) _____			
	2) _____			

3. Special Programs Inside the Library	Year Initiated	Date Terminated	Reason for Termination
a. ____Clubs			
b. ____Films and Film Programs			
c. ____Live Artists			
d. ____Lectures			
e. ____Book Talks			
f. ____Discussion Groups			
g. ____Art Exhibits			
h. ____Other (List)			
1)_____			
2)_____			
4. Special Programs Outside the Library			
a. ____Clubs			
b. ____Films and Film Programs			
c. ____Live Artists			
d. ____Lectures			
e. ____Book Talks			
f. ____Discussion Group			
g. ____Art Exhibits			
5. Special Services			
a. ____Information and Referral			
b. ____Information from On-line Data Bases			
c. ____Oral History			
d. ____Geneology			
e. ____Local History			
f. ____Bibliotherapy			
g. ____Job Information			
h. ____Lifelong Learning			
1)____Adult Basic Education classes			
2)____Graduate Equivalency Diploma classes			
3)____English as a Second Language classes			
4)____Literacy Volunteers			
5)____Independent Learning (organized program)			
6)____Education Brokering			
7)____Aging Awareness			
i. ____Services for Older Adult Service Providers			
j. ____Other (List)			
1)_____			
2)_____			

6. Promotion of Services	Year Initiated	Date Terminated	Reason for Termination
a. ____Newspapers			
b. ____Radio			
c. ____Television			
d. ____Brochures, Flyers, Newsletters			
e. ____Through Agencies for the Aging			
f. ____Other (List)			
1)_____			
2)_____			

IV. Administrative Organization for Older Adult Services

Please provide the information requested for the five major types of services provided currently through: Extension, Special Resources, Special Programs and Special Services.

Type and Title of Program or Service	Number of Persons 65+ Served Annually	Primary Library Department Responsible	Title of Person Responsible
1. Extension of Library Services			
2. Special Resources			
3. Special Programs IN the Library			
4. Special Programs OUT of the Library			
5. Special Services			

6. What is the number of full-time equivalent employees responsible to provide services to older adults?_____

V. Financial Support for Services to Those 65 Years and Older

Please indicate how much of your library's total budget is allocated for programs and services to the aging, as defined by this study.

	1984
1. Total amount budgeted for those 65+:	$_____
2. Amount obtained for those 65+ from local taxation	$_____
3. Amount obtained for those 65+ from other sources, including:	
a. LSCA	$_____
b. Older Americans Act	$_____
c. Other federal grants	$_____
d. State grants	$_____
e. Contracts for service	$_____
f. Philanthropy	$_____
1) Corporate giving	$_____
2) Foundations	$_____
g. Other (List)	
1) _____	$_____
2) _____	$_____
h. Total Other Sources	$_____

VI. Priorities for Service

Using a scale of 1 (highest) to 5 (lowest), please rank the relative priority your library now assigns to development of programs or services for the following age groups:

	Present Program Development Priority
Preschool (1 - 5)	_____
Children (6 - 12)	_____
Young Adults (13 - 20)	_____
Adults (21 - 64)	_____
Older Adults (65+)	_____

VII. Cooperative Development of Services Benefiting Those 65 and Older

Please note below any relationships that may exist between your library and community agencies and organizations which involve library services to older adults. Check the type of agency in the space provided to the left, then describe the relationship to the right.

Agency or Organization	Description of Relationship
1. ____Agencies for Aging	
2. ____Senior Centers	
3. ____Nursing Homes	
4. ____Church	
5. ____Educational	
6. ____Mental Health	
7. ____Nutrition	
8. ____Fraternal	
9. ____Union	
10. ____Health Care	
11. ____Other (List)	
a) _____	
b) _____	
c) _____	

VIII. Constraints

By placing a check in one of the three columns--most significant, significant, least significant, indicate the degree to which you believe the following factors operate as constraints or barriers to your library's capacity to serve the needs of those 65+.

	Most Significant	Significant	Least Significant
a. Insufficient availability of staff			
b. Inadequate transportation for older adults			
c. Library priorities for service			
d. Lack of staff training opportunities			
e. Fear for personal safety by older adults			
f. Inadequate publicity for existing services			
g. Library philosophy that most library Older Adult service needs should be met as a part of general services, not services specifically created for older adults			
h. Inadequate coordination among community agencies			
i. Lack of staff interest			
j. Lack of appropriate equipment and materials			
k. Inadequate funding			
l. Architectural barriers in libraries			
m. Lack of awareness of older adults' needs			
n. Lack of interest among older adults			
o. Other (List)			
1) _____			
2) _____			

IX. Employment of Older Adults by the Library

Does your library utilize any persons 65+ as:

a. Employees? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, how many?_____
b. Volunteers? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, how many?_____

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed addressed, postage-paid envelope by November 1, 1986 to:

Dr. Betty J. Turock
Rutgers School of Communication, Information and Library Studies
4 Huntington Street
New Brunswick, NJ 08903

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE AND INTEREST IN SERVICES TO OLDER ADULTS

Table I

Changes in Older Adult Population and in Libraries Providing Service

Region	Libraries						Older Adult Population in Thousands [28]					
	National Survey		Update Phase I		Change		National Survey		Update Phase I		Change	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
New England	25	10	25	9	0	0	1,315	7	1,651	6	336	26
Middle Atlantic	41	17	51	17	10	24	4,380	22	5,890	22	1,510	34
Midwest	71	29	87	30	16	23	4,834	24	6,045	23	1,211	25
South	44	18	61	21	19	39	3,633	18	5,258	20	1,625	45
Southwest	13	5	19	6	6	46	2,685	13	3,477	13	792	29
Mountain	23	9	23	8	0	0	604	3	837	3	233	39
West	27	11	27	9	0	0	2,522	13	3,430	13	908	36
Total	244	100	293	100	47	19	19,973	100	26,588	100	6,615	33

Table II

Changes in Percentage of Older Adult Population and Libraries Supplying Services by Residential Setting

Population/Setting	National Survey (n = 190)		Update Phase I (n = 288)	
	Libraries	Older Adults	Libraries	Older Adults
Rural (Less than 10,000)	17	39	13	37
Suburban (10,000-49,000)	26	28	31	33
Urban (50,000 and over)	57	33	56	30
Total	100	100	100	100

Table III

Services Currently Offered Older Adults
Through Public Libraries Reporting

Services	Libraries Offering Phase I	% (n = 318)	Libraries Offering Phase II	% (n = 275)
1. Extension				
Delivery to Institutions	167	53	98	36
Bookmobile: Standard entrance	105	33	42	15
Hydraulic lift	11	3	4	1
Deposit Collections: Senior Centers	114	36	36	13
Senior Housing	129	41	38	14
Nursing Homes	153	48	69	25
Books and Media by Mail	76	24	44	16
Homebound Services	167	53	106	39
Other	3	1	2	.7
2. Special Resources				
Large Print Books	288	91	232	84
Talking Books	186	58	151	55
Magnifying Devices	188	59	107	39
Ceiling Projectors	18	6	11	4
Page Turners	22	7	6	2
Kurzweil Reading Machines	29	9	9	3
Telecommunication Devices for the Deaf	81	25	19	7
Close Captioned Viewing Adaptors	28	9	8	3
Other	63	20	3	.1
3. Programs Inside the Library				
Clubs	52	16	32	12
Films and Film Programs	105	33	48	17
Live Artists	33	10	30	11
Lectures	64	20	53	19
Book Talks	55	17	45	16
Discussion Groups	47	15	40	15
Art Exhibits	82	26	53	19
Other	18	6	2	.7

Table III--continued

Services	Libraries Offering Phase I	% (n = 318)	Libraries Offering Phase II	% (n = 275)
4. Programs Outside the Library				
Clubs	29	9	17	6
Film and Film Programs	100	36	37	13
Live Artists	5	2	5	2
Lectures	32	11	19	7
Book Talks	89	30	45	16
Discussion Groups	22	7	6	2
Art Exhibits	8	3	3	1
Other	32	10	2	.7
5. Special Services				
Information and Referral	12	4	1	.3
Information from Online Data Bases	46	14	18	7
Oral History	50	16	38	14
Genealogy	125	39	88	32
Local History	121	38	89	32
Bibliotherapy	9	3	5	2
Job Information	60	19	35	13
Lifelong Learning				
Adult Basic Education	22	7	15	5
Graduate Equivalency Diploma Classes	14	4	11	4
English as a Second Language Classes	19	6	11	4
Literacy Programs	59	19	61	22
Independent Learning Program	7	2	4	1
Education Brokering	6	2	3	1
Aging Awareness	5	2	6	2
Services for Older Adult Service Providers	10	3	9	3
Other	6	2	1	.3

Table IV

Comparison of Major Programs of Service

Type of Services	National Survey Libraries (n = 244)		Update Phase I Libraries (n = 318)		Increase	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Extension	209	86	265	83	56	27
Special Resources	200	82	291	92	91	46
Group Programs						
Within the Library	93	38	146	46	53	57
Outside the Library	98	40	194	61	96	98
Special Services	N/A	N/A	180	57	180	100

N/A = Not Applicable

Table V

Major Programs of Service

Update Phase II

Type of Service	Libraries (n = 275) n	%
Extension	163	59
Special Resources	216	79
Group Programs		
Within the Library	80	29
Outside the Library	63	23
Special Services	127	46

Table VI

Older Adult Service Development

Services	Initiated						Terminated					
	1972-79		1980-86		Total		1972-79		1980-86		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Extension	716	22	157	5	873	27	60	10	154	26	214	36
Special Resources	581	18	240	7	821	25	10	2	12	2	22	4
Group Programs												
Within the Library	352	11	143	4	495	15	12	2	102	17	114	19
Outside the Library	415	13	102	3	517	16	20	3	121	21	141	24
Special Services	379	11	189	6	568	17	22	4	77	13	99	17
Total	2,443	75	831	25	3,274	100	124	21	466	79	590	100

Table VII

A Comparison of Older Adults Served in the National Survey and the Update

Service	National Survey	Update Phase I	% Growth	Market Penetration	Update Phase II	Market Penetration
Extension	61,639	163,477	1.65	.05	39,333	.08
Special Resources	10,685	125,948	10.79	.05	37,441	.09
Group Programs						
Within the Library	6,970	27,580	3.00	.02	28,596	.06
Outside the Library	10,201	99,797	8.78	.04	19,967	.06
Special Services	N/A	54,788	1.00	.04	6,855	.04

Table VIII

Promotion of Services

Medium	Phase I Libraries	% (n = 293)	Phase II Libraries	% (n = 240)
Newspapers	109	37	110	45
Radio	84	29	77	32
Television	42	14	30	13
Brochures, Flyers, Newsletters	128	44	101	42
Through Agencies for the Aging	96	32	68	28

Table IX

Differences in Priorities for Service Between Phase I Update Programs

Service Group	Phase I All Programs				1971 Longstanding Programs				1986 Newer Programs				t Value	df	2-Tail p
	N	$\bar{X}$	s	Rank	N	$\bar{X}$	s	Rank	N	$\bar{X}$	s	Rank			
Preschool	257	2.49	1.20	3	157	2.47	1.22	3	100	2.37	1.18	2	.53	255	.06
Children	257	2.43	.98	2	157	2.32	.96	2	100	2.59	1.00	3	-1.76	255	.08
Young Adult	257	4.22	1.01	5	157	4.13	1.05	5	100	4.37	.92	5	-1.60	255	.11
Adult	257	2.08	1.31	1	157	2.07	1.29	1	100	2.10	1.35	1	-1.39	255	.89
Older Adult	257	3.82	1.11	4	157	3.99	1.01	4	100	3.56	1.21	4	2.55	255	.01

Table X

Differences in Phase I and Phase II Priorities for Service

Service Group	Phase I				Phase II				t Value	df	2-Tail p
	N	$\bar{X}$	s	Rank	N	$\bar{X}$	s	Rank			
Preschool	257	2.49	1.20	3	215	1.90	1.05	1	4.71	470	.00
Children	257	2.43	.98	2	215	2.37	1.03	2	.51	470	.61
Young Adult	257	4.22	1.01	5	215	3.96	1.18	5	2.40	470	.02
Adult	257	2.08	1.31	1	215	2.39	1.36	3	-2.25	470	.03
Older Adult	257	3.82	1.11	4	215	3.72	1.16	4	.85	470	.40

Table XI

Update Priorities for Service in Frequencies and Percentages

Service Group	1				2				3				4				5				Total			
	Phase I		Phase II		Phase I		Phase II		Phase I		Phase II		Phase I		Phase II		Phase I		Phase II		Phase I		Phase II	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Preschool (Less than 5 years)	62	24	101	47	75	29	59	27	77	30	36	17	18	7	14	7	25	10	5	2	257	100	215	100
Children (6-12)	44	17	43	20	103	40	86	40	72	28	52	24	33	13	28	13	5	2	6	3	257	100	215	100
Young Adults (13-20)	5	2	11	5	18	7	19	9	23	9	37	17	80	31	54	25	131	51	94	44	257	100	215	100
Adults (21-64)	128	50	84	39	41	16	35	16	44	17	45	21	26	10	32	15	18	7	19	9	257	100	215	100
Older Adults (65+)	10	4	9	4	28	11	30	14	39	15	34	16	100	39	77	36	80	31	65	30	257	100	215	100

Table XII

Update Sources of Funding

Source	N		Budgeted							
			Phase I		Phase II		Phase I		Phase II	
	Phase I	Phase II	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
Local Taxation	98	104					$ 991,157	35	$ 565,185	49
Other Sources										
LSCA	56	10	$877,882	31	$269,481	23.				
CAA	6	1	56,638	2	3,500	.3				
Other Federal Grants	6	2	453,100	16	4,781	.4				
State Grants	21	10	368,144	13	240,751	21.				
Philanthropy	9	40	84,957	3	73,259	6.				
Total Other Sources	98	104					$1,840,721	65	$ 591,772	51
Total Amount Budgeted for those 65+	98	104					$2,831,878	100	$1,156,957	100

Table XIII

Funding Sources for Library Services to Older Adults

Study	Funding Sources									
	Federal		State		Local		Philanthropy		Total	
	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
National Survey	$ 565,054	59	$ 95,772	10	$229,853	24	$67,040	7	$ 957,719	100
Update Phase I	$1,387,620	49	$368,144	13	$991,157	35	$84,957	3	$2,831,878	100
Update Phase II	$ 277,762	24	$240,751	21	$565,185	49	$73,259	6	$1,156,957	100

Table XIV

Cooperation With Other Agencies

Type of Organization	Relationships			
	Phase I		Phase II	
	n	%	n	%
1. Social Service Agencies for Aging	158	22	60	13.
2. Senior Centers	88	13	121	26.
3. Nursing Homes	95	13	133	29.
4. Church	58	8	30	6.
5. Educational	53	8	30	6.
6. Mental Health	44	6	21	5.
7. Nutrition	65	9	22	5.
8. Fraternal	32	5	9	2.
9. Union	9	1	2	.4
10. Health Care	76	11	31	7.
11. Other	26	4	2	.4
Total	704	100	461	99.8

Table XV

Update Barriers to Serving Older Adults in Frequencies and Percentages

Constraints	Rank												Total			
	Most Significant = 3				Significant = 2				Least Significant = 1							
	Phase I		Phase II		Phase I		Phase II		Phase I		Phase II		Phase I		Phase II	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Insufficient availability of staff	28	11	113	50	117	48	69	30	101	41	45	20	246	100	227	100
Inadequate transportation for older adults	42	17	35	16	114	45	95	44	97	38	86	40	253	100	216	100
Library priorities for service	57	22	23	11	97	38	88	41	105	41	103	48	259	100	214	100
Lack of staff training opportunities	23	9	20	10	98	39	85	40	133	52	106	50	254	100	211	100
Fear for personal safety by older adults	11	4	10	5	25	10	35	16	221	86	168	79	257	100	213	100
Inadequate publicity for existing services	23	9	19	9	89	35	57	28	145	56	126	63	257	100	202	100
Philosophy that most library older adult service needs should be met as a part of general services, not services specifically created for elders	74	29	58	28	101	39	74	35	84	32	78	37	259	100	210	100
Inadequate coordination among community agencies	11	5	21	10	50	21	91	42	181	75	102	48	242	100	214	100
Lack of staff interest	32	13	9	4	76	30	39	19	147	58	163	77	255	100	211	100
Lack of appropriate equipment and materials	19	8	37	18	61	25	92	43	163	67	82	39	243	100	211	100
Inadequate funding	119	48	101	46	82	33	71	33	48	19	46	21	249	100	218	100
Architectural barriers in libraries	26	11	44	21	51	21	30	14	168	69	139	65	245	100	213	100
Lack of interest among older adults	10	4	10	5	47	20	75	35	181	76	125	60	238	100	210	100
Lack of awareness of older adults' needs	16	7	41	19	98	41	86	41	128	53	84	40	242	100	211	100

Table XVI

Differences in Phase I Barriers to Serving Older Adults

Constraints	All Programs			Longstanding Programs			Newer Programs			t value	df	2-Tail p
	N	$\bar{X}$	s	N	$\bar{X}$	s	N	$\bar{X}$	s			
1. Insufficient availability of staff	246	1.54	.71	159	1.56	.67	87	1.52	.65	-0.768	244	.44
2. Inadequate transportation	253	1.78	.71	163	1.76	.70	90	1.83	.74	-0.844	251	.40
3. Library priorities	259	1.82	.77	169	1.83	.77	90	1.79	.77	0.695	257	.69
4. Lack of staff training opportunities	254	1.57	.65	163	1.49	.60	91	1.71	.72	-2.715	252	.00
5. Older adults fear for personal safety	257	1.18	.49	167	1.19	.50	90	1.17	.46	0.392	255	.69
6. Inadequate publicity	257	1.53	.66	167	1.55	.67	90	1.48	.62	0.852	255	.39
7. Philosophy of service	259	1.96	.78	167	1.96	.78	92	1.97	.79	-0.092	257	.92
8. Inadequate coordination	242	1.30	.55	155	1.29	.53	87	1.31	.58	-0.272	240	.78
9. Lack of staff interest	255	1.54	.71	165	1.56	.72	90	1.52	.69	0.446	253	.66
10. Lack of appropriate equipment and materials	243	1.41	.63	157	1.41	.64	86	1.40	.62	0.446	257	.65
11. Inadequate funding	249	2.29	.77	157	2.31	.76	92	2.24	.79	0.220	241	.82
12. Architectural barriers	245	1.42	.68	159	1.46	.69	86	1.35	.65	0.722	247	.47
13. Lack of awareness of older adult needs	238	1.28	.54	153	1.25	.49	85	1.34	.61	-1.281	236	.20
14. Lack of interest among older adults	242	1.54	.62	156	1.51	.61	86	1.58	.64	-0.825	240	.41

Table XVII

Differences in Phase I and Phase II Barriers to Serving Older Adults

Constraints	All Phase I Programs			All Phase II Programs			t value	df	2-Tail p
	N	$\bar{X}$	s	N	$\bar{X}$	s			
1. Insufficient availability of staff	246	1.54	.71	227	1.70	.78	- 2.23	469	.03
2. Inadequate transportation	253	1.78	.71	216	2.24	.71	- 6.89	465	.00
3. Library priorities	259	1.82	.77	214	2.37	.67	- 8.32	469	.00
4. Lack of staff training opportunities	254	1.57	.65	211	2.41	.66	13.76	461	.00
5. Older adults fear for personal safety	257	1.18	.49	213	2.74	.54	-33.06	466	.00
6. Inadequate publicity	257	1.53	.66	202	2.53	.66	-16.21	455	.00
7. Philosophy of service	259	1.96	.78	210	2.10	.80	- 1.82	465	.07
8. Inadequate coordination	242	1.30	.55	214	2.38	.66	-10.94	452	.00
9. Lack of staff interest	255	1.54	.71	211	2.73	.53	-28.09	462	.00
10. Lack of appropriate equipment and materials	243	1.41	.63	211	2.21	.72	-12.68	466	.00
11. Inadequate funding	249	2.29	.77	218	1.75	.78	- 7.47	457	.00
12. Architectural barriers	245	1.42	.68	213	2.45	.81	14.72	460	.00
13. Lack of awareness of older adult needs	238	1.28	.54	210	2.55	.59	-23.86	444	.00
14. Lack of interest among older adults	242	1.54	.62	211	2.20	.74	-10.41	449	.00

Table XVIII

Older Adults as Employees and Volunteers

Study	Employees				Volunteers			
	Libraries		Number	$\bar{X}$	Libraries		Number	$\bar{X}$
	n	%			n	%		
National Survey	137	56	517	3.8	66	27	363	5.5
Update, Phase I	166	52	560	3.4	183	58	1,861	10.2
Update, Phase II	218	79	270	1.2	227	83	1,339	5.9

Table XVII

Differences in Phase I and Phase II Barriers to Serving Older Adults

Constraints	All Phase I Programs			All Phase II Programs			t value	df	2-Tail p
	N	$\bar{X}$	s	N	$\bar{X}$	s			
1. Insufficient availability of staff	246	1.54	.71	227	1.70	.78	- 2.23	469	.03
2. Inadequate transportation	253	1.78	.71	216	2.24	.71	- 6.89	465	.00
3. Library priorities	259	1.82	.77	214	2.37	.67	- 8.32	469	.00
4. Lack of staff training opportunities	254	1.57	.65	211	2.41	.66	13.76	461	.00
5. Older adults fear for personal safety	257	1.18	.49	213	2.74	.54	-33.06	466	.00
6. Inadequate publicity	257	1.53	.66	202	2.53	.66	-16.21	455	.00
7. Philosophy of service	259	1.96	.78	210	2.10	.80	- 1.82	465	.07
8. Inadequate coordination	242	1.30	.55	214	2.38	.66	-10.94	452	.00
9. Lack of staff interest	255	1.54	.71	211	2.73	.53	-28.09	462	.00
10. Lack of appropriate equipment and materials	243	1.41	.63	211	2.21	.72	-12.68	466	.00
11. Inadequate funding	249	2.29	.77	218	1.75	.78	- 7.47	457	.00
12. Architectural barriers	245	1.42	.68	213	2.45	.81	14.72	460	.00
13. Lack of awareness of older adult needs	238	1.28	.54	210	2.55	.59	-23.86	444	.00
14. Lack of interest among older adults	242	1.54	.62	211	2.20	.74	-10.41	449	.00

Table XVIII

Older Adults as Employees and Volunteers

Study	Employees				Volunteers			
	Libraries		Number	$\bar{X}$	Libraries		Number	$\bar{X}$
	n	%			n	%		
National Survey	137	56	517	3.8	66	27	363	5.5
Update, Phase I	166	52	560	3.4	183	58	1,861	10.2
Update, Phase II	218	79	270	1.2	227	83	1,339	5.9